DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 940 UD 026 118

AUTHOR	Ascher, Carol
TITLE	Improving Chapter 1 Delivery. ERIC/CUE Digest Number 39.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jan 88
CONTRACT	OERI-R188062013
NOTE	4p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; *Delivery Systems; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; High Risk Students; Low Achievement; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; School Schedules; *Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

Researchers and educators have begun to question whether Chapter 1 pull-out programs are the most effective method of delivering extra help to the students who need it. Pull-out programs are still the predominating type, but may be declining in popularity as in-class programs gain favor. This document summarizes a variety of program designs which are used nation-wide to provide Chapter 1 services to students. They are the following: (1) pull-out programs which provide instruction outside of the classroom and have advantages and disadvantages to student achievement and school organization; (2) add-on programs which take place beyond the regular instructional times and may cause difficulties in scheduling and transportation; (3) in-class instruction in which there is usually a Chapter 1 specialist along with the regular teacher in the students' classroom; and (4) replacement programs which provide Chapter 1 students with separate classes for all of the instruction they are to receive in a given subject and which reduce the class size for regular teachers in some areas of instruction. Research has suggested some more effective methods, but national, state, and local laws impede the success and flexibility of service delivery. A list of eight references is included. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION: DIGEST Number 39, January 1988

IMPROVING CHAPTER 1 DELIVERY

ED292940

UD026118

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

4-26-88

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION

DIGEST

Number 39, January 1988

ISSN 0889 8049

IMPROVING CHAPTER 1 DELIVERY

After over 20 years of Federally funded compensatory education, recently researchers and educators alike have begun to question whether the predominating method of delivering the extra help to the students who need it is most effective. Although most schools with Chapter 1 used pull-out programs, partly because Federal guidelines were thought to encourage them (Archambault, 1986), pull-outs may be declining somewhat in favor of in-class program (Archambault, 1986; Knapp, Turnbull, Blakely, Jay, Marks, & Shields, 1986).

In fact, if one looks at Chapter 1 nationally, a variety of designs are used to provide Chapter 1 services to students. They are described below.

Pull-Out Programs

Pull-outs provide student instruction in locations outside the regular classroom. They can be either "limited," accounting for as little as 15 minutes of a Chapter 1 student's school day; or "extended," comprising up to an hour of the school day. Often, particularly at the elementary level, pull-out arrangements are coupled with in-class arrangements; inside the classroom, Chapter 1 assistance is provided by an aide, while in the separate room a teacher/specialist is usually in charge. At the secondary level, pull-outs often last 45 minutes a day, or the equivalent of an elective period (Knapp, et al., 1986).

A national evaluation of Title I, Chapter 1's predecessor until 1981, argued that pull-out arrangements resulted in smaller instructional groups and higher staff-to-student ratios, and that these smaller, more intense units led to more student on-task work, less teacher time on behavioral management, a more harmonious classroom atmosphere, and a higher quality of cognitive monitoring and organization of activities (Carter, 1984). However, more recent research generally does not support either the cost-effectiveness or the educational benefits of pull-out over other program structures (Archambault, 1986; Wilkinson, 1986). Even when pull-out situations have effective aspects, there are unintended negative effects that cannot be ignored (Archambault, 1986; Wilkinson, 1986; Knapp, et al., 1986):

1. ***Decreased instructional time,*** because of time Chapter 1 students spend transferring to a different location and receiving special compensatory education services.

2. ***Fragmentation,*** because students may not see the relationship between the same subject taught in both the regular and Chapter 1 classroom.

3. ***Stigma*** attached to Chapter 1 pull-out students may encourage regular teachers to expect less from them.

4. ***Student tension,*** because of lack of communication, cooperation, and coordination that commonly exists between the Chapter 1 instructor and the regular teacher. Research suggests that low-achieving students are particularly vulnerable to tension and other negative interactions.

5. ***Segregation,*** because minority students receive more compensatory education than white students, and are thus pulled out and placed in more segregated classrooms for special instruction.

6. ***Lower student achievement*** that results from the school's inability to create the strong achievement-oriented culture recognized as important to effective schooling.

Add-On Programs

Add-on instruction can take place at any grade level as well as any time of day or year beyond the regular instructional times. By their very nature, the most obvious difficulties of add-on programs arise in scheduling and in providing transportation. Add-on programs are often used to fund pre-kindergarten programs or to extend a kindergarten program to a full day (Knapp, et al., 1986). This, of course, follows the research supporting the effectiveness of early enrichment.

Add-ons also follow from research suggesting that time-on-task increases achievement; however, because student engagement does not necessarily increase with time spent in school, evidence is mixed about the effectiveness of adding to the number of hours a student spends in school each day, week, or year (Cooper, 1986). Nevertheless, add-on programs are also placed before or after the regular school day, on weekends, or as extensions of the school year. The most common form of add-on instruction in Title I (the most recent data available) was in summer programs.

Summer add-on programs raise additional uncertainties. Based on evidence that low-achieving students may have "summer losses" relative to other students, many administrators encourage summer school programs. Yet the evidence is mixed on both the loss without summer programs, and the possible gains (or decreased losses) that Chapter 1 summer programs can generate (Heynes, 1986; Carter, 1984; Williams, Richmond, & Mason, 1986).

In-Class Programs

In-class instruction furnishes extra enrichment to students within their regular classrooms. Although many pedagogical arguments in favor of in-class compensatory education could be garnered from the general research literature, Chapter 1 in-class programs are rare. Thus, little Chapter 1 evidence directly supports the success of this structure.

What existing anecdotes and conjectures suggest is that in-class learning offers a number of advantages. It can lower the student/adult ratio by providing in-class aides (Knapp, et al., 1986). It can also cut out a good deal of the time for transporting students to and from pull-out programs (one estimate is 15 minutes a day, or 40 hours a year), which can be used for learning (Archambault, 1986). Particularly when aides are used, in-class arrangements are cheaper than pull-outs (Knapp, et al.,

UD026118

1986, p. 83). However, when the Chapter 1 teacher is a specialist, in-class programs create territorial uneasiness on the part of both the regular teacher and the specialist.

Clearly, more must be done if in-class programs are to fulfill their potential. Methods proven successful in teaching heterogeneous groupings in other situations—cooperative learning and peer tutoring, for example—should be applied to classes with Chapter 1 students. However, since successful teaching in heterogeneous classrooms requires special training, it has been suggested that compensatory education specialists do this training. Since evidence is very mixed on the effectiveness of the role of instructional specialists as it is now defined, training the regular teachers may well be a more productive use of their time (Archambault, 1986).

Replacement Programs

These programs provide to Chapter 1 students all the instruction they are to receive in a given subject, usually in a separate class containing only compensatory education students. A district can legally use a "replacement" if it contributes its own resources. Most replacement programs in one sample were reading or math programs that lasted the equivalent of a class period, but some districts have day-long replacement programs, particularly at the first grade level (Knapp, et al., 1986). According to an educator in one evaluated replacement program, a school-wide program in Austin, Texas, this project was successful because it not only reduced class size but also eliminated the problem of "outside interferences in one teacher's responsibility for the learning of each student. There were no Title I teachers, there were no Title I aides, there was no Title I curriculum, there were no Title I supervisors" (Holley, 1986, p. III-101). In other words, everyone was working together and separately in what was, in fact, a Title I school.

Conclusion.

Federally funded education has had a mixed record of success in structuring the delivery of its instructional services. Because of bureaucratic constraints at the national, state and local levels, it has often been difficult to restructure the delivery of Chapter 1 instructional services, even when research has suggested that new methods might be more effective. Further, disadvantaged students might learn even more if, for instance, the sizes of their regular classes were reduced substantially, or if Chapter 1 teachers were more fully incorporated in the school's overall instructional program (Kennedy, Jung, & Orland, 1986, p. 90).

—Carol Ascher

References

Archambault, F.X., Jr. (1986, December). Instructional setting: Key issue or bogus concern. In B.I. Williams, et al. (Ed.), pp. II-60—II-76.

Carter, L.F. (1984, August/September). The sustaining effects study of compensatory and elementary education. *Educational Researcher. 13* (7), 4-13.

Cooper, H.M. (1986, December). Chapter 1 programs reduce student-to-instructor ratios but do reduced ratios affect achievement? In B.I. Williams, et al., pp. III-35—III-58.

Heyns, B. (1986, December). Summer programs and compensatory education: The future of an idea. In B.I. Williams, et al. (Ed.), pp. III-27—III-34.

Holley, F. (1986, December). Program staffing and structures: Reactions from a quarter-century worker in compensatory education. In B.I. Williams, et al. (Ed.), pp. III-95—III-116.

Kennedy, M.M., Jung, R.K., (Orland, M.E. (1986, January). *Poverty, achievement and the distribution of compensatory education services.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Knapp, M.S., Turnbull, B.J. Blakely, C.H., Jay, E.D., Marks, E.L., & Shields, P. (1986, December). *Local program design and decision making under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.* Report for OERI/NIE Contract No. 400-85-1029. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Williams, B.I., Richmond, P.A., & Mason, B.J. (1986, December). Review of Conference Discussion and Conclusions. In B.I. Williams, et al. (Ed.), pp. I-2—I-26. *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc.

The complete report upon which this Digest is based, ***Chapter 1 Programs: New Guides from the Research, by Carol Ascher*** (Trends and Issues No. 7), is available for $3.00 from ERIC/CUE, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-3433
Erwin Flaxman, Director
Wendy Schwartz, Editor

ERIC/CUE Digests draw together and summarize key information on current educational issues. Occasionally a Digest is devoted to a single report or study that is of major importance. Single copies of the **Digests** are available free from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education if the request is accompanied by a stamped self-addressed envelope. Please write to the Clearinghouse for permission to reproduce.

This Digest was developed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education with funding from Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. R188062013. The opinions expressed in this Digest do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education